



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,359	01/28/2004	Hiroaki Kishioka	Q79404	1537
65565	7590	04/01/2010	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE-265550			DESAI, ANISH P	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213			1787	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/01/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

SUGHRUE265550@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/765,359	KISHIOKA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANISH DESAI	1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,5 and 6 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5 and 6 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/28/09</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments received on 12/15/09 have been fully considered.
2. In view of applicant's amendment, 112-second paragraph rejections as set forth on page 5, section 15 of 04/10/09 Office action (OA) are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a double-sided PSA tape comprising at least two PSA layers, wherein both PSA layers are *compositionally different* from each other, does not reasonably provide enablement for both PSA layers having *same composition*.**
4. Claim language requires that each adhesive layer has a specific peeling adhesive strength, which is different from one another. Further, the adhesive strength of the touch panel side PSA is measured to norbornene resin based film and the adhesive strength of the display device side PSA is measured to a glass plate or

triacetal cellulose film. The Examiner submits that the difference in the adhesive strength as claimed can be achieved by (**A**) providing both PSA layers with **same adhesive composition** and since each adhesive layer is bonded to a **different substrate** (i.e. a PSA bonded to norbornene and a PSA bonded to glass or triacetal cellulose); the adhesive strength of each adhesive will be different or (**B**) both PSA layer have different adhesive strengths because **each is formed of a different composition**.

5. The Examiner submits that the scope of claim 1 encompasses aforementioned situations (A) and (B), whereas the specification is only enabled for (B). Therefore, the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope (i.e. situation (A) above) with these claims.

6. Case law holds that applicant's specification must be "commensurately enabling [regarding the scope of the claims]" ***Ex Parte Kung***, 17 USPQ2d 1545, 1547 (Bd. Pat. App. Inter. 1990). Otherwise undue experimentation would be involved in determining how to practice and use applicant's invention. The test for undue experimentation as to whether or not all compounds within the scope of claim 1 can be used as claimed and whether claim 1 meets the test is stated in ***Ex parte Forman***, 230 USPQ 546, 547 (Bd. Pat. App. Inter. 1986) and ***In re Wands***, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed.Cir. 1988). Upon applying this test to claims 1, 2, 5, and 6, it is believed that undue experimentation would be required because:

7. (a) The quantity of experimentation necessary is great since claim 1 reads on a double-sided PSA sheet containing at least two PSA layers, wherein each PSA

layer has same adhesive composition, while the specification discloses that each PSA layer has different adhesive composition. For example, as shown in Example 1 of the specification, the PSA labeled as "A1" and the PSA labeled as "A2" are formed of different adhesive composition (see Preparation Example 1 having 92 parts of butyl acrylate vs. Preparation Example 2 having 98 parts of butyl acrylate).

8. (b) There is no direction or guidance presented for aforementioned situation (A).

9. (c) There is an absence of working examples concerning the aforementioned situation (A).

10. In light of the above factors, it is seen that undue experimentation would be necessary to make and use the invention of claims 1, 2, 5, and 6.

11. **Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.**

12. Claim 1 recites "the double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive has a thickness of not more than 50 μm ". The specification fails to provide support for "not more than 50 μm ". It is submitted that there is support in the specification to recite that the double-

sided PSA has thickness of 10-50 or 20-50 micrometers on page 32 lines 5-9 of the specification but no support to recite “not more than 50 µm” which includes values less than 10 such as 0.5, 1, 2 etc. for which there is no support. Applicants pointed to page 51 lines 1-4 of the specification for support (see page 7 of 12/15/09 amendment). However, this refers to two specific examples which have thickness of 40 microns and 50 microns and utilize ***specific acrylic polymer*** and does not provide support to ***broadly recite*** that the thickness is less than 50 microns.

13. Similarly, regarding claim 1 limitation “the major monomer for the respective pressure-sensitive adhesive layers is constituted from the ***same monomer***”, the specification fails to provide support for said limitation. While there are specific examples in the specification that utilize polymer made from the same monomer, i.e. ***butyl acrylate***, this does not provide support to broadly recite that the major monomer for each layer is constituted from the same monomer. In other words, claim language of “same monomer” is broader in scope than what is supported by the specification. While specification provides support to recite that major monomer component in each PSA layer is butyl acrylate as stated on page 21 and in Example 1 of the specification, there is no support to broadly recite “same monomer”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1, 2, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishioka (US 2002/0098352 A1) in view of Hitoshi et al. (EP 0930322A2).

15. Regarding claim 1 and 5 recitations “adhesive sheet to be used in sticking and fixing a touch panel to a display surface of a display device” and “The double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet...which is used for fixing a display device to a touch panel in the inner touch panel system” are interpreted as an intended use of the double-sided PSA sheet.

16. Kishioka discloses a pressure-sensitive adhesive composition and a pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet that is used to stick and fix an optical film on the display panel of a display device (abstract).

17. As to the claim limitation of “wherein the double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet has at least two pressure-sensitive adhesive layer but does not have a substrate”, at paragraph 0065 Kishioka discloses “The pressure-sensitive adhesive

layer can be constituted of a **plurality of layers** through another layer or **through no another layer**" (0065). This disclosure of Kishioka is interpreted to meet Applicant's aforementioned claim limitation.

18. As to the claim requirement of the total thickness of the double-sided PSA sheet of no more than 50 µm, it is noted that at paragraph 0064, Kishioka discloses thickness of the individual PSA layer in general ranges from 5 to 500 µm and from about 10 to 100 µm. Further, Kishioka states that the thickness of the PSA layer can be appropriately set as long as the handling properties are not deteriorated. While Kishioka does not explicitly teach the total thickness of the PSA sheet, it is submitted that based on the information given in Kishioka's disclosure with respect to the individual thickness of the PSA layer, selecting the total thickness of the PSA sheet so as to arrive at the Applicant's claimed thickness would have been obvious, motivated by the desire to provide suitable handling properties to the PSA sheet of Kishioka.

19. With respect to the claim recitation "wherein the respective pressure-sensitive adhesive layers each comprises an acrylic polymer containing...dodecyl (meth)-acrylate", the pressure sensitive adhesive of Kishioka is formed of **acrylic polymer** comprising monomer components of the aromatic ring-containing copolymerizable monomers, **the copolymerizable monomers containing no aromatic ring**, the monomer for modification etc. (0043). **As monomers containing no aromatic ring**, Kishioka discloses monomers such as alkyl (meth)acrylates wherein the alkyl

group has from one to 18 carbons. These monomers are methyl (meth)acrylate, ethyl(meth)acrylate etc. (see 0038-0039).

20. With respect to the claim limitation “the major monomer for the respective pressure-sensitive adhesive layers is constituted from the same monomer”, the Examiner submits that as set forth previously, Kishioka's PSA sheet includes plurality of PSA layers (0065) and Kishioka further discloses same PSA composition as that of claimed by Applicant (0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to form each PSA layer of Kishioka's adhesive sheet from same monomer, motivated by the desire to simplify the process of forming the PSA sheet.

21. **Kishioka is silent as to teaching “the proportion of the major monomer component constituting each pressure-sensitive adhesive layer is 80% by weight or more based on the whole amount of the monomer components”.**

22. However, Hitoshi discloses a pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet based on acrylic adhesives that are useful as fixing tape, masking tapes, etc. for electronic parts (0002-0003). The adhesive tape of Hitoshi comprises from 70 to 100% by weight of a (meth)acrylic acid alkyl ester having on average 2 to 14 carbon atoms of the alkyl group based on the total amount of the monomers (0008). Additionally, the disclosure of Hitoshi at paragraph 0017 is interpreted as the presence of 85% to 95% by weight of (meth) acrylic acid alkyl ester monomer provides well balanced adhesive property and

heat resistance. Further, the adhesive sheet of Hitoshi is excellent in transparency, foaming resistance, low out-gassing property, heat resistant and weather resistant (abstract).

23. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the proportion of the major monomer component in the amount of 80% by weight or more in the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer, motivated by the desire to form the pressure-sensitive adhesive tape having excellent adhesive property, heat resistance, foaming resistance, low gas-out property, discoloring resistance, and transparency.

24. As to the claim features "the double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet is capable of being adhered substantially entirely on the touch panel, and the other surface is capable of being adhered substantially entirely on the display surface of the display device", the double-sided PSA sheet having "optical isotropy", and "wherein the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer in the touch panel side has 180° peeling adhesive strength...so that the double-sided pressure-sensitive adhesive sheet is...touch panel", it is reasonable to presume that said features are necessarily present in the double-sided PSA sheet of Kishioka as modified by Hiroshi.

25. The support for said presumption is based on the fact that the double-sided PSA sheets of Applicant and that of Kishioka as modified by Hitoshi comprise at least two

PSA layers wherein the PSA sheet has thickness of not more than 50 micrometers.

Further, the double-sided PSA sheet of Kishioka as modified by Hitoshi comprise same acrylic polymer as set forth in claim 1.

26. Based on the aforementioned facts, the double-sided PSA sheet of Kishioka as modified by Hiroshi is structurally and compositionally equivalent to the double-sided PSA sheet of Applicant as claimed in claim 1. Therefore, the aforementioned properties would intrinsically be present in the double-sided PSA sheet of Kishioka as modified by Hiroshi. The burden is shifted to Applicant to prove it otherwise (*In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 594).

27. Regarding claim 2, it is respectfully submitted that Kishioka generally discloses that the PSA layer of his invention can be constituted of **plurality of layers** (0065). Thus, choosing the number of PSA layers (e.g. three to five) as claimed would have been obvious, motivated by the desire to form PSA sheet having suitable thickness with suitable handling properties.

28. **Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishioka (US 2002/0098352 A1) in view of Hitoshi et al. (EP 0 930 322 A2) as applied to claims 1, 2, and 5 above, and further in view of Okabe et al. (JP 07-105781-abstract and English translation).**

29. Regarding claim 6, Kishioka does not explicitly teach a touch-panel provided display device, wherein a display device and a touch panel are fixed to each other via the double-sided adhesive sheet.

30. However, Okabe discloses a transparent touch panel structure wherein the transparent touch panel and the display panel is stuck to each other by an acrylic adhesive with good transparent property (see abstract).

31. It is noted that Kishioka generally discloses a sheet wherein the PSA composition has excellent adhesive performance (0082). Further the PSA sheet of Kishioka is used in the liquid crystal display area. Kishioka does not explicitly teach a touch panel-provided display device. However, the reference of Okabe discloses such a claimed display device, wherein the display device and the touch panel are fixed to each other by the double-sided adhesive sheet.

32. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the double-sided adhesive sheet of Kishioka as modified by Hiroshi and bond the touch panel and display device as taught by Okabe, motivated by the desire to form a touch panel-provided display device that has excellent adhesive performance.

Response to Arguments

33. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/15/09 have been considered but they are not found persuasive.

34. With respect to 112-first paragraph rejection, on pages 5-6 of the amendment, applicant asserts that while claim 1 requires that the two PSA layers are formed from the same monomer as the major monomer component; claim 1 does not require that the two adhesive layers must have the same composition.

35. Additionally on page 6 of the amendment, applicant asserts that "Further, the Examiner appears to recognize that the peeling adhesive strength of the two PSA layers is different as measured based on the different substrates to which each is bonded. However, it is not clear why the Examiner does not consider the present specification to be enabling for the claimed invention wherein the PSA layers have the same kind of monomer in an amount of 80% or more by weight and have different peeling adhesive strengths to different substrates. The Examiner has not met his burden for providing a reasonable technical basis for asserting the present invention as claimed is not enabled by the specification." (see second full paragraph on page 6 of the amendment).

36. In response, the Examiner submits that it appears that applicant has misunderstood the Examiner's enablement rejection. Further, the Examiner submits

that the technical basis for the aforementioned rejection is provided by the Examiner on pages 2-3, section 5 of 04/01/09 OA.

37. It is respectfully submitted that claim language requires that each adhesive layer has a specific peeling adhesive strength, which is different from one another. Further, the adhesive strength of the touch panel side PSA is measured to norbornene resin based film and the adhesive strength of the display device side PSA is measured to a glass plate or triacetal cellulose film.

38. It is submitted that the difference in the adhesive strength as claimed can be achieved by **(A)** providing both PSA layers with ***same adhesive composition*** (i.e. each PSA layer is formed of same monomer **and** weight% of said monomer in each PSA layer is same). In this arrangement, since each adhesive layer is bonded to a ***different*** substrate (i.e. PSA 1 is bonded to norbornene and PSA 2 is bonded to glass or triacetal cellulose); the adhesive strength of each adhesive will be different or **(B)** both PSA layer have different adhesive strengths because ***each PSA is formed of a different composition*** (i.e. each PSA layer is formed of same monomer, except that weight% of said monomer in each layer is different).

39. ***It is respectfully submitted that applicant's specification is only enabling for situation/embodiment described in (B), but claims are broader in scope such that the situation/embodiment described by (A) is also encompassed by the***

scope of claim 1. Therefore, the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope (i.e. situation/embodiment described by (A)) with these claims.

40. With respect to the art rejections of Kishioka (US 2002/0098352) in view of Hitoshi (EP0930322), on pages 10-11 of the amendment, applicant does not agree with the Examiner's position that the double-sided PSA sheet of Kishioka as modified by Hitoshi necessarily has the features of "wherein the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer in the touch panel side has a 180° peeling adhesive strength...and the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer in the display side has a 180°-peeling adhesive strength...of not more than 5.0N/20mm". In order to support these arguments, applicant submits that the total thickness of the double-sided PSA sheet of the claimed invention is not more than 50 micrometers. According to applicant, Kishioka discloses thousands of possible combinations of the thicknesses of the two PSA layers and there is no apparent reason to choose two or more PSA layers, each having a thickness within the very broad range taught by Kishioka, such that the total thickness would be within the claimed range of not more than 50 micrometers.

41. The Examiner respectfully disagrees for the following reasons:
42. It is noted that at paragraph 0064, Kishioka discloses thickness of the individual PSA layer in general ranges from 5 to 500 µm and from about 10 to 100 µm and

therefore if two PSA layers are used, it is clear that the thickness would be 5-1,000 µm and 20-200 µm, which clearly overlaps the presently claimed thickness. As set forth in MPEP 2144.05, in the case where the claimed range “overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art”, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists, *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Further, Kishioka states that the thickness of the PSA layer can be approximately set as long as the handling properties are not deteriorated. While Kishioka does not explicitly teach the total thickness of the PSA sheet, it is submitted that based on the information given in Kishioka’s disclosure with respect to the individual thickness of the PSA layer, selecting the total thickness of the PSA sheet so as to arrive at the Applicant’s claimed thickness would have been obvious, motivated by the desire to provide suitable handling properties to the PSA sheet of Kishioka.

43. On page 11 of the amendment, applicant argues that EP’322 also fails to teach or suggest the total thickness of a double-sided PSA sheet having at least two PSA layers. Applicant further asserts that “EP’322 teaches that the PSA layer has a thickness of from 10 to 100 µm. There are thousands of possible combinations of the thicknesses of two PSA layers having a thickness within the range taught by EP’322 and there is no apparent reason to choose the two or more PSA layers, each having a thickness within the range taught by EP’322, such that the total thickness would be within the claimed range of not more than 50 µm.” (see last full paragraph on page 11 of the amendment). Further, on page 12 of the amendment, applicant further argues that

"EP'322 also fails to teach or suggest that the major monomer in the PSA layers is the same monomer. Also, the disclosure of EP'322 at paragraph [0036] cannot be fairly interpreted as reading on a double-sided adhesive sheet having at least two PSA layers and no substrate, since this portion of EP'322, specifically teaches "the layer of the pressure-sensitive adhesive is stuck to one surface or both surface of the base material and...." (see third full paragraph on page 12 of the amendment).

44. In response, the Examiner submits that while EP'322 does not disclose all the features of the present claimed invention, EP'322 is used as teaching reference, and therefore, it is not necessary for this secondary reference to contain all the features of the presently claimed invention, *In re Nievelt*, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973), *In re Keller* 624 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). Rather this reference teaches a certain concept, namely the proportion of the major monomer component constituting each pressure-sensitive adhesive layer is 80% by weight or more based on the whole amount of the monomer components as presently claimed and in combination with the primary reference, discloses the presently claimed invention.

45. On page 12 of the amendment, applicant argues that the total thickness of no more than 50 micrometers leads to excellent optical characteristics as can be seen from Examples 1 and 2 in Table 1 of the specification.

46. In response, the Examiner submits following:

47. From reviewing the specification, it appears that by reciting "optical characteristics", applicant is referring to "The total luminous transmittance". The Examiner submits that the data is not persuasive because the data is not commensurate in scope with the scope of the present claims, given that the data shown in Example 1 and 2 is narrower in comparison to what is claimed.

48. Further, in Example 1 thickness of the double-sided PSA sheet is 40 microns whereas the thickness in the comparative Example 1 is 52 microns, and there is a difference in optical characteristics. But this comparison is not persuasive given that there is not side-by-side comparison between the inventive example and the comparative example given that the comparative example 1 utilizes a PET layer that is not found in Example 1. Additionally, while optical characteristics of Example 1 rate a circle and the optical characteristics of comparative example1 rate an "X", it is not clear that there is any significant different between the optical characteristics given that an "X" represents luminous transmittance of 5% or more which therefore includes 5% and circle represents luminous transmittance of less than 5% which therefore includes

values of 4.8%, 4.9%, 4.9999% etc. Thus, there appear to be little, if any difference between the optical characteristics of these examples.

49. Moreover, as set forth in MPEP 716.02(d), whether unexpected results are the result of unexpectedly improved results or a property not taught by the prior art, "objective evidence of nonobviousness must be commensurate in scope with the claims which the evidence is offered to support". In other words, the showing of unexpected results must be reviewed to see if the results occurred over the entire claimed range. *In re Clemens*, 622 F.2d 1029, 1036, 206, USPQ 289,296 (CCPA 1980). Applicant has not provided data to show that the unexpected results do in fact occur over the entire claimed range of thickness.

50. On page 12 of the amendment, applicant argues that even if Kishioka and Hitoshi were combined, the resulting PSA tape would not be compositionally equivalent to the claimed invention. According to Applicant "Present claim 1 requires that the major monomer in the PSA layers is the **same monomer.**" (second full paragraph on page 12 of the amendment).

51. The Examiner respectfully submits that as set forth previously, Kishioka's PSA sheet includes plurality of PSA layers (0065) and Kishioka further discloses same PSA composition as that of claimed by Applicant (0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to form each PSA layer of Kishioka's adhesive sheet from same monomer,

motivated by the desire to simplify the process of forming the PSA sheet. Accordingly, applicant's arguments are not found persuasive and the art rejections are sustained.

52. On page 13 of the amendment, with respect to the art rejections of claim 6, applicant has essentially incorporated same arguments as presented previously with respect to Kishioka et al. and EP'322. In response, the Examiner incorporates his rebuttal as set forth previously by reference.

Conclusion

53. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

54. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

55. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANISH DESAI whose telephone number is (571)272-6467. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00AM-5:30PM.

56. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Callie Shosho can be reached on 571-272-1123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

57. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/Callie E. Shosho/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794